

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 17 and 19 are amended. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Chau in the October 21, 2004 personal and the October 26, 2004 telephonic interviews. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

A. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. US 2003/0217124 A1 to Parry. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Parry fails to disclose or teach all of the features recited in these claims. Specifically, Parry fails to disclose or teach the feature of "an inputting component which allows a user to manually input access requirements to setting an information set in the printing device," as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9, or the step of "manually inputting access requirements to setting information set in the printing device," as recited in amended independent claims 17 and 19. See also, e.g., pg. 10, lines 2-5.

The Office Action on page 2 asserts that Parry teaches an inputting component which inputs access requirements to setting information set in the printing device at paragraphs [0018] and [0019]. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

Instead, Parry discloses printing devices that include various types of memory firmware and/or software. Further, Parry only describes a network administrative system with a network device management program which may be used to monitor and/or control various

network devices. (See Parry, e.g., paragraphs [0010] - [0013]). Thus, Parry does not disclose an inputting component that requires a user to manually input access requirements.

Further, Parry does not recite the feature that a user manually inputs access requirements to setting information set in the printing device. In other words, a user must input access requirements in an inputting component on the printing device, for example, a password, in order to access the setting information of the printing device. The text of Parry relied on by the Office Action does not disclose this feature recited in amended claims 1, 9, 17 and 19.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 9, 17 and 19 are patentable over Parry. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of claims 1, 9, 17 and 19 from which they respectfully depend, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

B. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Parry in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,534 to Yamunachari et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Yamunachari fails to make up for the deficiencies of Parry with respect to claim 1 from which claim 6 depends. Yamunachari is cited in the Office Action only for allegedly disclosing the use of a network manager MIB to notify the operator with information that alters searching variables in the printer.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is patentable at least in view of the patentability of claim 1 from which it depends, as well as for the additional features it recites.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection over Parry and Yamunachari is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Parry in view of Tajima (JP 07-256948). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Tajima fails to make up for the deficiencies of Parry with respect to claim 9 from which claim 13 depends. Tajima is cited in the Office Action only for allegedly disclosing a printing apparatus including a display unit or a display component for displaying the setting functions of the printing data stored in the buffer means.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/ksz

Date: October 28, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461